DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 555 CG 025 993

AUTHOR Bloser, Edward Charles
TITLE The Relationship between Marital Adjustment and Sibling Constellation.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 97p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Birth Order; Family (Sociological Unit); *Family Influence; Family Size; Family Structure; Marital Instability; *Marital Satisfaction; Marriage Counseling; *Sibling Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Complementarity; Locke Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale; *Marital Adjustment; *Marital Therapy

ABSTRACT

The conflict in research that exists between the relationship of marital adjustment and sibling constellation is examined here. The belief that the combination of birth order and gender (sibling constellation) is important, is not only a part of folk wisdom but it is a continuing point of view in the literature of marital and family therapy. Data from 250 married subjects were separated into three categories of marital complementarity and relationships and associations were analyzed on the basis of composite scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test, the number of marriages, and the length of each marriage. The results indicate that the structure of the family of origin has no relationship with current marital adjustment. Across all degrees of complementarity, martial adjustment scores, including happiness, were almost equal. Marital discord, therefore, does not lie in the number and gender of siblings with which one was raised; birth order as a factor in marital adjustment must be eliminated. The findings should form the basis of counselor education courses that focus on counseling couples who show signs of marital discord. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 379 555

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARITAL ADJUSTMENT AND SIBLING CONSTELLATION

CG025993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. BLOSER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Copyright © 1993 by Edward Charles Bloser
All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

This research examined the conflict in the literature that exists about the relationship of marital adjustment to sibling constellation. Adlerians propose that there are certain learned, yet almost inherent qualities about an individual's birth order that determine whether a particular relationship will endure and whether the partners will be happy. The belief that the combination of birth order and gender (sibling constellation) is important, is not only a part of our folk wisdom but is a continuing point of view in the literature of marital and family therapy.

Walter Toman (1961) is the chief proponent for the duplication theory that "the closer the new relationships come in kind to old ones . . . the better will the person be prepared for the new ones, and the greater their likelihood to last and to be happy and successful" (p. 6). Two studies conducted by Weller, Natan, and Hazi in 1974 and 1975 confirmed Toman's theory. However, other researchers and sociologists, such as Terman (1938), Forer (1969), and Birtchnell and Mayhew (1977), maintain that there is no basis for marital adjustment in sibling birth order and gender.

Data from two hundred fifty married subjects were separated into the three categories of marital complementarity proposed by Toman (1961) and relationships and associations were examined on the basis of (1) composite scores on the Locke- Wallace Marital Adjustment Test (LWMAT), (2) the number of marriages, and (3) the length of each marriage. Testing revealed that the "ideal" couples of the first degree, scored exactly the same as those of the third degree. Toman's theory did not stand up to the rigorous test of a standardized

instrument, long used to empirically measure marital adjustment. Results revealed that 78% of those in the first degree had one marriage while 82% of those in the third degree of complementarity had only one marriage. Those in the second degree of complementarity had longer marriages than those in the first degree, and the couples in the third degree had the longest marriages of all.

In a counseling setting, when couples present with marital adjustment problems, one area that need not be investigated is birth order and sibling constellation--it makes no difference. There may be a reason for marital discord, but it is not found in the number and gender of siblings with whom one was raised. Birth order is not an ingredient of marital adjustment. The findings should form the basis of counselor education course content that focus on counseling couples showing signs of marital discord.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION. 1

Background and Rationale of the Study. 1

Problem Statement. 3

Definition of Terms. 4

Hypotheses. 5

Limits of the Study. 7

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE. 8

Introduction. 8

Marital Adjustment. 8

Marital Adjustment, Birth Order, and Sibling Constellations. 9

Agreements with Toman. 12

Theoretical and Empirical Disagreements with Toman. 14

Divorce. 15

Measurement of Marital Adjustment. 20

Components. 21

Research Using the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test. 21

Summary 23

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS. 24

Population. 24

Method and Procedures. 26

Data. 26

Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test. 27

Reliability. 27

Validity. 27

Scoring. 28

Research Design and Analysis of the Data 28

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS. 30

Complementarity as Indicated by Scores on the

Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test 30

Hypothesis One 30

Hypothesis Two 31

Complementarity and the Number of Marriages 33

Hypothesis Three 33

Hypothesis Four 33

Complementarity and the Number of Marriages 33

Hypothesis Five 34

Hypothesis Six 36

Summary 37

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION. 38

Complementarity and Marital Satisfaction as Indicated by Composite Scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test. 38

Complementarity and the Number of Marriages. 40

Complementarity and the Length of Marriage. 40

Marital Adjustment and Culture. 41

Age and Marital Adjustment. 42

Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Research. 43

REFERENCES. 45

APPENDICES. 55

VITA. 81

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Classification of Marital Constellations.	11
2.	Summary Outline of 354 Reasons Why Couples Break Up.	18
3.	Demographic Information about the Respondents.	25
4.	Scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test by Degrees of Complementarity with the Five Year Rule Applied	31
5.	ANOVA Summary Table for Comparing Degree of Marital Configuration to Composite Scores on the LWMAT, Using the Five Year Rule	31
6.	Scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test by Degree of Complementarity, with the Five Year Rule Disregarded	32
7.	ANOVA Summary Table for Comparing Degree of Marital Configuration to Composite Scores on the LWMAT, with the Five Year Rule Disregarded	32
8.	Number of Marriages by Degree of Complementarity Used in Hypothesis Three, with the Five Year Rule Applied	33
9.	Number of Marriages by Degree of Complementarity Used in Hypothesis Three, with the Five Year Rule Disregarded	34
10.	Number and Average Length of Marriage by Degree of Complementarity, with the Five Year Rule Applied	35

11. ANOVA Summary Table for Comparing Degree of Marital Configuration to Average Length of Marriage, with the Five Year Rule Applied 35
12. Number and Average Length of Marriage by Degree of Complementarity, with the Five Year Rule Disregarded 36
13. ANOVA Summary Table for Comparing Degree of Marital Configuration to Average Length of Marriage, with the Five Year Rule Disregarded 37
14. Scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test by Degree of Complementarity, with and without the Five Year Rule 38
15. Number of Marriages by Degree of Complementarity, Used in Hypotheses Three and Four, with the Five Year Rule Applied and Disregarded 40
16. Average Length of Marriage by Degree of Complementarity, with the without the Five Year Rule 41

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> In a certain district of Germany there is an old custom for testing whether an engaged couple are suited for married life together. Before the wedding ceremony, the bride and the bridegroom are brought to a clearing where a tree trunk has been cut down. Here they are given a two-handed saw and set to work to saw the tree across. By this test it is found out how far they are willing to cooperate with each other. It is a task for two people. If there is no trust between them they will tug against each other and accomplish nothing. If one of them wishes to take the lead and do everything by himself, then, even if the other gives way, the task will take twice as long. They must both have initiative, but their initiatives must combine together. These German villagers realized that cooperation is the chief pre-requisite for marriage. (Adler, 1931, p. 263)

Background and Rationale of the Study

Married couples who are dissatisfied with their marriages often seek advice and counsel. They may initiate intervention or have it imposed on them by court order when they file a suit for divorce. The attempt is to make an effort at reconciliation, even at the eleventh hour. The divorce rate is high in the United States (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1991) and has been for

some time--the cycle of marriage and separation continues to repeat itself (Wilson, 1991). A counselor facing a dissatisfied couple recognizes that counseling or marital therapy is no panacea, that the couples' disenchantment may eventually lead to termination of the relationship. This study focused on ascertaining whether a person's sibling constellation in the family of origin, in combination with the constellation of their spouse, has any effect on the success or failure of the marital adjustment. There is a conflict in the literature. Many theorists advocate that sibling constellation is the determinant of the patterns of interaction and behavior which make marital adjustment possible or impossible. A body of literature and research exists in which no relationship between sibling constellation and marital adjustment was found.

Of all the theories about success or failure in marriage, Adlerians (Hall, Lindzey, Loehlin, & Manosevitz, 1985; Thompson & Rudolph, 1992) propose that there are certain learned, yet almost inherent qualities about an individual's birth order that determine whether a marital relationship will endure and whether the partners will be happy. Many believe that the combination of birth order and gender, sibling constellation, is important. It is not only a part of our folk wisdom but is a continuing point of view in the literature of marital and family therapy. Leman (1992) wrote that "Premarital counseling . . . doesn't include what I have seen to be a very important factor . . . *birth order*" (p. 11). In a section titled "So whom does Sally choose?" Leman wrote:

> That depends on whether she herself is a Firstborn, Middle born or Last born. Her chances of happiness are also improved if she

has a brother in the same birth-order position as her mate, and if he has a sister in the same position as Sally. (p. 12)

Toman (1970) wrote in Psychology Today, a popular and widely read magazine: "Never Mind Your Horoscope, Birth Order Rules All." Freeman (1992), in his second treatise on family therapy, wrote that:

> Being the oldest in the family trains one in how to take on responsibility and be in control. On the other hand, being the last born in the family provides one with the sense that there is someone there to help out and take control or responsibility. (pp. 27-28)

In 1961 Toman published Family Constellation, a landmark work that predicted marital adjustment based on birth order. He said that "whatever people a person chooses for spouses . . . will be co-determined by the kinds of people a person has been living with the longest, most intimately, and most regularly" (p. 6). Toman goes on to say that "*the closer the new relationships come in kind to old ones, to those already entertained . . . the better will the person be prepared for the new ones, and the greater their likelihood to last and to be happy and successful*" (p. 6). At this point, Toman added a new dimension to simple, straight-forward birth order, and that is the gender of a person's siblings. He includes the sex of siblings as a source of the learning that individuals bring with them to their marriage relationship.

Problem Statement

Some theorists and researchers (Bank & Kahn, 1982; Kemper, 1966; Toman and Gray, 1961; Weller, Natan & Hazi, 1974) agree with Toman that

the partners bring to the marriage from their family of origin an indisputable "dowry" of sibling constellation. Other researchers and sociologists (Birtchnell & Mayhew, 1977; Ernst & Angst, 1983; Forer, 1969; Kelly & Conley, 1987; Levinger & Sonnheim, 1965; Pinsky, 1975; Sutton-Smith & Rosenberg, 1970; Terman, 1938; Vos & Hayden, 1985) maintain that there is no basis for marital adjustment in sibling birth order and gender. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to attempt to resolve the conflict in the literature about the association between marital adjustment and sibling constellation.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were often used in a specific way in this study and are operationally defined here to facilitate their understanding.

Birth Order. A listing of one's siblings and the order in which they were born, without regard to gender.

Complementarity. The degree to which one's sibling constellation complements that of the spouse. There are three degrees of complementarity depending on how close a couple comes to the ideal. The first degree, or ideal, has two possible configurations: (1) older brother of a sister married to the younger sister of a brother, or (2) older sister of a brother married to the younger brother of a sister. The third degree of complementarity involves any and all marital combinations with an only child. All the rest are in the second degree.

Marital Adjustment. The degree to which individuals adjust and adapt to the many facets of their marriages. Marital adjustment is used to "refer to those processes . . . necessary to achieve a harmonious and functional marital relationship" (Sabatelli, 1988, p. 894). Adler's 1931 story is an example of adjust-

ing and adapting, which would contribute to enduring marriages. For the purposes of this dissertation, marital adjustment is treated as a global concept encompassing marital happiness and marital satisfaction.

Marital Configuration. The sibling constellation of oneself and one's spouse.

Marital Happiness. One element, albeit a considerable one, that contributes to total marital adjustment. Of itself happiness does not guarantee stable relationships.

Marital Satisfaction. The degree to which individuals are willing to say that they are pleased with the many elements that constitute their marriages.

Only Child. This can be the only child born to parents. It can also be individuals born more than five years after their older sibling, or five years before their next younger sibling (Toman, 1961).

Sibling Constellation. This is a listing of one's brothers and sisters, the order in which they were born, and their ages.

Hypotheses

Complementarity as Indicated by Scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test

Hypothesis One.

Depending on the degree of complementarity, are there differences in marital adjustment scores? According to predictions based on Toman's theory, those in the first degree of complementarity should score higher in adjustment than those in the second degree, who will score higher than those in the third degree. Null hypothesis: there will be no difference in the means of the test scores for those in the various degrees of complementarity.

Hypothesis Two.

Are there differences in the marital adjustment scores if we do not group persons into degrees of complementarity using Toman's (1961) five year rule, which begins a new and separate sibling constellation in a family if a child is more than five years older or younger than his/her nearest sibling. With this in mind the author re-classified the whole family as one constellation, no matter how many years separated the siblings. Null hypothesis: there will be no difference in the means of the test scores for those individuals considered as coming from a family of origin of only one constellation.

Complementarity and the Number of Marriages

Hypothesis Three.

Is there an association between the various degrees of complementarity and the number of marriages? Using the complementarity theory, we expected that those in the first degree would have fewer marriages that those in either of the other degrees. Null hypothesis: there will be no differences in the number of marriages for those in any of the degrees of complementarity.

Hypothesis Four.

Is there an association between the various degrees of complementarity, with the five year rule ignored, and the number of marriages? As in hypothesis three, when using the complementarity theory, we expected that those in the first degree of complementarity, with the five year rule disregarded, would have fewer marriages that those in either of the other degrees. Null hypothesis: there will be no differences in the number of

marriages for those in any of the degrees of complementarity when they are considered as coming from a family of origin of only one constellation.

Complementarity and the Length of Marriage

Hypothesis Five.

Is there an association between the three degrees of complementarity and the length of a marriage? It follows logically from Toman's theory that those who have a greater degree of complementarity in their marriage will stay married longer than those who do not. Null hypothesis: there will be no difference in the length of a marriage for those in the various degrees of complementarity.

Hypothesis Six.

Is there an association between the three degrees of complementarity and the length of a marriage if the five year rule is ignored? Those who have a greater degree of complementarity in their marriage are expected to stay married longer than those who do not. Null hypothesis: there will be no difference in the length of a marriage for those in the various degrees of complementarity when individuals are considered as coming from a family of origin of only one constellation.

Limits of the Study

The sample for this study was as close to the general heterosexual population as possible and representative of married persons. All respondents demonstrated some success at marital adjustment by virtue of the fact that they were currently married. Married persons who were institutionalized or

in out-patient therapy for marital problems were not included. Persons living together as common law spouses, and those born outside the United States of America were not included in the study. The study relied on the self-report of the respondents. No opportunity was available to personally interview the subjects.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Toman was influenced by Adler, who wrote in 1930 that there are "three fundamental questions of individual and social life," the first being social relation [sic], which is "making friends and getting along with people" (p. 17), the second, making use of one's life on earth and the third, "the fact that mankind is divided into two sexes" (p. 19). The first was germane to our study, especially as it applies in a marriage. The second was not as essential but the third question was of particular importance. By combining the first question with the third, it was conceptualized that there was a distinction between getting along with men and with women, and this difference was going to be critical to marital relationships.

Marital Adjustment

Marital adjustment was used to "refer to those processes . . . necessary to achieve a harmonious and functional marital relationship (Sabatelli, 1988, p. 894). In this dissertation, marital adjustment was treated as a global concept encompassing marital happiness and marital satisfaction. If a couple were well-adjusted, as suggested by Adler's story in Chapter 1, they were satisfied with each other and with themselves. It was with this traditional view of adjustment that we examined relationships and relied upon the respondents' subjective opinion about their marriage and their personal assessment about the various factors that comprise adjustment.

Bowen (1978) wrote that "The concept of sibling position had been poorly defined since the late 1950s, but it had to wait until Toman's Family Constellation (1961) provided structure" (p. 358). Toman expressed his principal conviction that "*the closer the new relationships come in kind to old ones, to those already entertained . . . the better will the person be prepared for the new ones, and the greater their likelihood to last and to be happy and successful*" (1961, p. 6). Another German, Konig (1963), published Brothers and Sisters: A Study in Child Psychology two years after Toman's 1961 classic, but makes no reference to him. The original title of the book was The Order of Birth in the Family Constellation. In the introduction, Konig made a definitive statement when he wrote "The ranks of birth imprint their traits on each one of us" (p. 16).

Independently, with no references shared with Toman's work, Stotland, Sherman, and Shaver (1971) wrote "schema theory implies that an individual internalizes the system of interpersonal relationships he found in his family and tends to repeat this familial structure visibly and overtly in his adult years" (p. 47). They continued by expressing that "A person's position in his family at birth has a large influence on the social relationships available for him to perceive, and therefore on the social schemas he may acquire" (p. 48). This was a position shared by Forer (1973), who adds that "Some people are driven, often with no awareness, to duplicate their childhood sibling

position [in marriage]" (p. 185). Birtchnell (1974) was not as extreme when he wrote that birth order may potentially influence some aspects of marital relationships.

In 1959 and 1960 Toman presented his theory for predicting marital satisfaction much as he did in the classic work of 1961. "*A . . . relationship will tend to have better chances of happiness and success . . . the closer it duplicates for both partners the earliest intra-familial patterns for heterosexual relationships*" (1960, p. 241), i.e. "the order and sexes of his siblings" (1959, p. 200). "This rule has been called the duplication theorem" (Toman, 1976, p. 80). Marital satisfaction can be predicted from the order of birth of siblings, and one's sex. The constellation of the siblings of one's family of origin will determine future happiness.

The constellation possibilities, based on two children per family, as delineated by Toman (1960, 1961, 1969, 1988), are presented in Table 1. There are married people who may have trouble with order of rank in their relationship and those who may have trouble adjusting to the sex of the spouse. For example, if a boy with younger sisters married a girl who has a younger brother, they might have difficulty establishing who is senior in the relationship. The boy was used to having a girl as his junior, and the girl grew up being senior to her brother. Neither of them would be uncomfortable with a person of the opposite sex in the household. By way of contrast, if a boy with a younger brother married a girl with a younger brother, then not only would they have a seniority problem, but he had no experience with a female in the house who is his peer.

Table 1.

Classification of Marital Constellations

Constellation	Husband	Wife	Rank Difficulties	Husband-Sex Difficulties	Wife-Sex Difficulties
One	Older brother of a sister	Younger sister of a brother	No	No	No
Two	Older brother of a sister	Older sister of a brother	Yes	No	No
Three	Older brother of a sister	Older sister of a sister	Yes	No	Yes
Four	Older brother of a sister	Younger sister of a sister	No	No	Yes
Five	Older brother of a brother	Older sister of a brother	Yes	Yes	No
Six	Older brother of a brother	Older sister of a sister	Yes	Yes	Yes
Seven	Older brother of a brother	Younger sister of a brother	No	Yes	No
Eight	Older brother of a brother	Younger sister of a sister	No	Yes	Yes
Nine	Younger brother of a sister	Younger sister of a brother	Yes	No	No
Ten	Younger brother of a sister	Younger sister of a sister	Yes	No	Yes
Eleven	Younger brother of a sister	Older sister of a brother	Yes **	No	No
Twelve	Younger brother of a sister	Older sister of a sister	Yes	No	Yes
Thirteen	Younger brother of a brother	Older sister of a brother	Yes	Yes	No
Fourteen	Younger brother of a brother	Older sister of a sister	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fifteen	Younger brother of a brother	Younger sister of a brother	Yes	Yes	No
Sixteen	Younger brother of a brother	Younger sister of a sister	Yes	Yes	Yes

** This combination comes close to being optimal, but there will be some reverse authority in their relationship; the wife will tend to be dominant and the husband dependent.

Note. Adapted from Toman (1960, 1961, 1969, 1988).

Bowen (1978) wrote:

> Toman studied only normal families, and he made no effort to study the ways a profile can be altered by the family projection process. For instance, if an oldest child is the object of a moderately severe family projection process, he is likely to become helpless and complaining and to marry an equally impaired spouse who overfunctions as the protective mothering one. In this family, the second child in the sibling order is likely to have the characteristics of an oldest child. (p. 206)

Is there a difference between actual birth order and psychological birth order? Campbell, White, and Stewart (1991) demonstrated that the factors of age, gender, number of parents, blended families, step-parenting, death, and divorce have an effect on the actual birth order. Their inquiry might have inspired a re-definition of birth order as it has been handed down from Toman, but was beyond the scope of this study. Toman did account for both age and gender in his 1969 work.

Agreements with Toman

In the Preface to the second edition of Family Constellation, Toman (1969) wrote that there have been "no major changes in the original propositions and descriptions . . . and all theorems about social interaction according to family constellations have held up well in empirical tests. Systematic investigations have yielded essentially positive results and confirmed the theory" (p. iv). One of these investigations was done by Toman (1962) with 16 couples married for 10 years or more, matched with 16 divorced couples.

Some family therapists (Bank & Kahn, 1982) agree with Toman in theory and others have conducted research that support his theory. Toman and Gray (1961) showed that 93 couples in "disturbed" marriages showed less complementarity in the order of rank in their relationships than 309 couples in "normal" marriages. These "disturbed" couples were found to be less oriented toward the other sex than their "normal" counterparts, who were parents of college students, and other married couples.

Kemper (1966) studied the marital satisfaction of husbands. He found that "men with younger sisters married to women with older brothers are more satisfied than men with older sisters who are married to women with younger brothers" (p. 348), which agrees completely with Toman's theory. These men are in the first degree of complementarity. Kemper also found that "men with younger sisters and no older sisters who are married to women with older brothers are more satisfied than men with older and younger sisters who are married to women with older brothers" (p. 348), which is was almost identical to the first example, and was the second case where couples have the most chance for marital adjustment. Kemper based his reasoning on a man's need for power, dominance, and a unique American culture. He assumed that "dominance leads to satisfaction" (p. 349).

A study of marital adjustment was done by Weller, Natan, and Hazi (1974). There were 258 women, enrolled in cooking, cosmetics, home economics, and sewing classes, excluding those married less than three years. They reported on rank order among siblings, and did not take gender into account. Later-born women who married first-born males reported the highest degree of marital satisfaction. In 1975 these same authors found that

when women who are older marry a brother who is younger, they have the same characteristics in the marriage as a younger sister who marries an older brother. The studies conducted by Weller, Natan, and Hazi in 1974 and 1975 serve to confirm Toman's theory that those in the first degree of complementarity will have the happiest marriages.

Theoretical and Empirical Disagreements with Toman

The following assessments yielded findings that were not consistent with or in agreement with Toman's theory. Many social scientists maintain that there is no basis for marital satisfaction in sibling birth order and gender. Written in 1938, Terman's Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness spells out that "one's chances of happiness in marriage are not appreciably affected by the circumstance of having or not having siblings of the opposite sex" (p. 210). In her 1969 work, Forer, who has written extensively about birth order, says that "older children tend to select spouses who are younger . . . . This does not necessarily mean that the marriage will be a happier one than a marriage with a spouse from another sibling role" (p. 8).

Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1970) and Ernst and Angst (1983), authors well-known for their writings on birth order, took a more conservative approach: "Common sense dictates that our brothers and sisters, our siblings, have some effect on our personality and development" (Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg, 1970, p. 1). As for Toman's theory that "marriage relationships will be more successful if they duplicated earlier sibling relationships," Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg related that "research has given only partial support" (p. 7). They continued with a sampling of reports that do not support Toman's theory.

An assessment with 50 couples using Toman's sibling constellation hypothesis was completed by Levinger and Sonnheim (1965). They "found no association between [the] birth order of either partner and the adjustment of the marriage" (p. 143). No differences were statistically significant. The

researchers stated that there must be more to marital adjustment than family constellation. Birtchnell and Mayhew (1977) tested Toman's theory with 982 happily married persons and 1,012 unhappy ones, and failed to support it. In a separate study with 329 undergraduates, Birtchnell and Mayhew (1977) further refuted Toman's hypotheses. A dissertation study of 40 newly married couples from dormitories in the Boston area (Pinsky, 1975) determined that among those in the first degree of complementarity there were "mainly sex differences rather than sib[ling] order differences as predicted by Toman" (p. 3032-B), whose theory of complementarity was not supported. Vos and Hayden (1985), by using the Spanier Dyadic Adjustment Scale with 327 couples, found no association between birth order complementarity and marital adjustment.

In a longitudinal study of 300 couples that ran from 1930 until 1980, Kelly and Conley (1987) determined that personality and in particular the neuroticism of the husband was the factor most closely related to an enduring, stable, well-adjusted marriage. Their investigation was not done to confirm or deny one point of view; it was open to ideas throughout the duration of its existence. The above researchers, who included almost 3,800 people in their investigations, demonstrated that there is no relationship between sibling constellation and marital adjustment. There are other factors that may well contribute to marital adjustment (Kelly and Conley; 1987). The present study was an attempt to resolve the disagreement in the literature.

Divorce

The divorce rate is steadily declining but still overwhelming. Across the United States the rate peaked at 5.0 per thousand in 1986, was 4.9 in 1987, 4.8 in 1988, and 4.7 in 1989 (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, p. 62). Even second and third marriages often result in dissolution. Today, more marriages are terminated by divorce than by the death of either spouse (Wilson, 1991). In the same region where this study was centered, a twelve-person church choir has seen the divorce of seven of its members in the past five years. The eighth is expected any day. Religion has less and less influence on stabilizing marriages or preventing divorces, according to a study done at Brigham Young University (Heaton and Cornwall, 1989). It serves merely to delay an inevitable divorce (Chan and Heaton, 1989), but does play some role in marital duration. The percentage of couples whose marriages lasted five years or longer was highest for Jews, followed by conservative Protestants, liberal Protestants, Roman Catholics, then those with no religious affiliation (Maneker and Rankin, 1991).

Divorce is an accepted fact of life. Based on an informal sample at the library of a large southern university, more books were published on therapy following a divorce and on adjustment problems for children of single-parent and blended families that on what it takes to make a marriage a success. Chiriboga, Catron and Associates (1991) examined the psychological adaptation that follows a divorce. Their work was originally funded by the National Institute on Aging and they focused on mutual factors that related to the death of a spouse in old age. No apparent difference appeared between the loss of a spouse through death, divorce, or legal separation. Each of these

demanded a similar acceptance and adjustment in order to get on with one's life.

In a review of court cases, the means by which marriage is regulated, Davis and Murch (1988) gave three reasons, distinct from the legal grounds, for why marriages fail. First, there was not as much social or religious pressure to remain married; second, our expectations for marriage have changed (Hiller & Philliber, 1986), and third, women have become emancipated and have greater financial independence (Greenhaus, Bedeian, & Mossholder, 1987; Schumm & Bugaihis, 1986). Apparently these reasons have not filtered through to the pre-marital phase of a relationship.

There are many institutional, social, peer, and parental pressures for a person to marry and to remain married. Single corporate managers, whether male or female, do not get promoted to highly visible executive level jobs. Presidential candidates have a very supportive wife at their side. The Catholic Church (Young and Griffith, 1991) is willing to grant a decree of nullity on the basis that one of the parties, at the time of marriage, was psychologically incapable of making a life-long commitment. If Granny is representative of others her age, there was no way she could divorced, but she once went six years without saying a word to Grandpa.

"No one is ever to blame when a marriage ends: marriages just break down sometimes, people grow apart" (Glendon, 1987, pp. 107-108). Through an in-depth interview study in a kibbutz in Tel Aviv, Kaffman, Elizur, Shoham and Gilead-Roelofs (1989), found 354 reasons why couples break up. These are outlined in Table 2.

Table 2.

Summary Outline of 354 Reasons Why Couples Break Up

I. Covert conflict with marital dissatisfaction - 37%
   a. Low level of affinity of interests and activities - 12%
   b. Affectional alienation (lifeless marriage) - 11%
   c. Poor communication - 9%
   d. Divergent personal growth - 5%

II. Overt conflict with marital disagreement - 26%
   a. Arguments and quarrels on numerous subjects - 11%
   b. Quarrels centered on lack of mutuality - 9%
   c. Quarrels centered on kibbutz matters - 3%
   d. Quarrels centered on childrens' problems - 3%

III. Involvement with a third party - 22%
   a. Respondent's extramarital relationship - 10%
   b. Spouse's extramarital relationship - 12%

IV. Sex problems - 3%

V. Escape from overdependent relationship - 6%
   a. Clinging Overattachment - 5%
   b. Extreme jealousy - 1%

VI. Disabled partner - 4%
   a. Mentally ill spouse - 2%
   b. Chronic physical illness of spouse - 2%

VII. Ambiguous answers - 2%

Davis and Aron (1988), in private practice, interviewed recently divorced women and reported that the most frequent reasons given were (1) physical abuse, (2) husband's extramarital affair, (3) husband's desire for independence, and (4) communication problems. These are similar to the grounds presented by applicants for divorce: (1) physical abuse, (2) financial problems, (3) alcoholism, (4) neglect of home and children, and (5) mental cruelty (Levinger, 1966). On the other hand, Spanier and Margolis (1983) argued that a husband's extra-marital affair was an effect, not a cause, of marital failure. Mid-life crises of both spouses was determined to be the cause by both Arnold and McKenry (1986) and Iwanir and Ayal (1991). The chief complaints were needs for intimacy, perceptions of problems in the relationship and in each other, and communication styles among 134 physicians and 125 of their wives (Gabbard, Menninger, & Coyne, 1987. Perception problems and communications were the major factors discovered by Yelsma (1984).

An association exists between divorce and the depression that often accompanies it (Epstein, 1984; Merikangas, 1985). In states where the divorce rate was low, suicide rates were corresponding low (Boor & Bair, 1990). However, the depression may precede either a divorce or a suicide. Married people who are depressed may deal with their problems by separating, thinking that the grass is greener outside of marriage. Anti-depressants are often prescribed for the symptoms of impotence for men seeking marital counseling, and suicide or divorce is not an option. The relationship was not making them unhappy, it was an endogenous depression. States that had low rates of divorce and low rates of suicide also had low rates of alcohol

consumption (Dunn, Jacob, Hummon, & Seilhamer, 1987; Roberts, Floyd, O'Farrell, & Cutter, 1985; Yang and Lester, 1991).

The one factor that correlates most highly with marital adjustment is time--the length of time married. White and Booth (1991) and Grover, Russell, Schumm, and Paff-Bergen (1985), found exactly what this author discovered in a preliminary study done on marital adjustment (Bloser, 1988): those married more than fifteen years had a greater degree of marital adjustment. The above researchers argue that there are more barriers and fewer alternatives to divorce the longer a couple is married. Barriers include dependent children, wife's unemployment, a shared social network (see Mkhize below), financial ties, and conservative values. The alternatives, which usually decrease, are the wife's income and remarriage prospects. If barriers fall and viable alternatives exist then a higher divorce rate occurs.

The professional counselor can assume all the responsibility of a caring relationship that is often lacking in a marriage, but must carefully assess and respect the wishes and needs of the presenting couple. As a mediator, the counselor can only help the couple through an adjustment, whether it be to a more stable marriage or to an acceptable divorce. One's theoretical orientation will largely determine a plan of treatment. Behavioral changes that a couple wants to make are facilitated by the professional therapist, and an analysis of the families of origin may give them new insight about past relationships, which set them up for their current marital dilemma. The literature provided evidence that sibling constellation in the family of origin does not relate to current adjustment. If it is not efficacious, counselors should not rely on it to modify a marital relationship. It is wrong for a

counselor to tell a couple in the third degree of complementarity that they never should have gotten married in the first place--their relationship was doomed to failure. Nor should a counselor tell a couple that they have the most ideal of all relationships, and that something must be wrong with them because the marriage does not work. The current study was done to resolve the conflict in the literature whether sibling constellation is related to marital adjustment.

Measurement of Marital Adjustment

The standard for marriage adjustment inventories is the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test (LWMAT) (Fredman & Sherman, 1987; Hunt, 1978; Schumm et al., 1986; White, 1990), as found in Appendix A. With 15 items the test is considered a short instrument; previous marital adjustment inventories all have over 100 and up to 246 questions. Locke and Wallace chose items that were "most basic and which had the greatest correlation with the total test score" (Fredman and Sherman, 1987, p. 46). Eleven of the 15 items are used in almost identical format as the 1976 Spanier Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

Components

The Marital Adjustment Test contains the various components that make up a harmonious relationship: happiness, finances, recreation, demonstration of affection, friends, behavior, philosophy of life, in-laws, problem solving, outside interests, leisure time, trust, and marital satisfaction. Pasley, Thinger-Tallman, and Coleman (1984) state that the topics that comprise marital adjustment are: (1) amount of time spent with spouse, (2) ways to

spend extra money, (3) sex life, and (4) job or work decisions. Critics suggest that the Locke-Wallace instrument may not reflect marital issues (content validity) of the 1990s (Sabatelli, 1988). Even though the Locke-Wallace test may be old, it does not use any terms which are unfamiliar to modern individuals or which have a different meaning in today's vocabulary. It is one that has been used extensively in research involving marital adjustment.

Research Using the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test

The Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test has been used in many settings. Black (1982) used it as part of the application form for a couples weight loss program. Both the person on the diet and the spouse or helper had to complete the test. Those who showed the most dissatisfaction with their marital relationship lost the most weight. Brackney (1979) found that when marital conflicts were at a minimum, patient adaptation to a dialysis program was enhanced. In a program for pediatric cancer patients, Zevon (1986) found that the quality of the parents' relationship was significantly related to the child's coping competence, and not to the parents' coping strategies.

Waldron and Routh (1981) measured the effects of the first child on the marital relationship. In a study of abusive and non-abusive parents seeking help with child management, Butler and Crane (1980) found the LWMAT effective in discriminating between stressed and non-stressed marriages. Coleman and Miller (1975) used the test with couples seeking counseling when one or both had symptoms of depression and found a significant correlation between depression and marital adjustment. In a study involving parental depression and child behavior problems, Schaughnecy and Lahey

(1985) used the LWMAT as one of the corroborating measures. In an assessment of parents' interaction with their infant, Cook (1979) predicted that those with high marital adjustment scores would spend more time looking at their infant and initiating communication that those with low scores. The findings were not significant but they did support the predictions.

Dudley and Kosinski (1990) used the LWMAT in a survey of religiosity and marital satisfaction among Seventh Day Adventists. Meyer and Pepper (1977) utilized this test with young married couples and found greater marital adjustment if their need for affiliation, aggression, autonomy, and nurturance were being met. Plechaty (1989), found that marital adjustment depended on the couple's living conditions. Rabin, Margolin, Safir, and Talovic (1986) found a high level of similarity between happy and unhappy Israeli and American couples. (See also McKenry (1986) and Iwanir and Ayal (1991) above).

Wives with field dependent husbands showed more marital dissatisfaction than those with husbands who are field independent (Sabatelli, 1982). In long-term marriages, Schaupp (1985) found that high scores on the LWMAT were positively correlated with femininity scores on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, both for males and for females. Correspondingly, Ziegler (1982) found no significant relationships between androgyny and marital satisfaction. Sporakowski and Hughston (1978) worked with couples married more than 50 years, using the LWMAT to determine their degree of adjustment. In accordance with common law in Texas, Tiggel (1982) included cohabiting couples in his study of factors relating to marital satisfaction.

Summary

"Cooperation is the chief pre-requisite for marriage" (Adler, 1931, p. 263). This message implies that a couple will be doing something to make their marriage, their relationship, one in which they get along and pursue common goals. Sawing the tree across presents a wonderful picture of adjustment and cooperation. Why is it that the divorce rate is staggering? Independent studies reveal that there are anywhere from three causes to 354, which indicates we do not know. If a unique cause were known, then counseling could play a role in redirecting the efforts of the partners toward a mutual goal. If we find a clue in the sibling constellation of the family of origin, we can use that information to improve a marital relationship. Since there is nothing that we can do to change the past, the best we can hope for is that we use the knowledge of the past, or the family of origin, to help us make the future better. If, however, it is found that the family of origin or sibling constellation cannot predict marital adjustment, why should we expend energy in promoting it's usefulness? This study is an effort to determine whether sibling constellation is useful.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES FOR DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Population

The population for this research was made up of married couples born in the United States. The respondents were from 29 states, as reflected in Appendix B. The majority of the respondents, 53%, were born in Tennessee, where this study was conducted. Many of the other subjects may have moved to Tennessee, even though they were born elsewhere. Responses received from persons born outside the United States were not utilized. Those who did not indicate in which state they were born were retained in the data pool and analysis. Students from two counseling theories classes in a large university in Tennessee were asked to send the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test (LWMAT) and sibling questionnaire to married friends and relatives across the country. Additional subjects were collected from local churches and social organizations in order to maximize participation by a diverse sample of the community. Over two hundred subjects participated in the study.

One hundred seventy-two females (67.7%) and 82 males (32.3%) responded to the questionnaires. Female respondents ranged in age from 19 to 68, and males from 22 to 72. Of the 254 participants, 251 provided the information necessary to determine how long they have been married. Two hundred five of the participants (80.7%) were married just one time. In this group of subjects most were married when they were 23. Five of them were married before they reached the majority age of 18 and five of them after they

had passed 45. Additional demographic information about the respondents is reported in Table 3.

Method and Procedures

The students were given instructions about the study and the forms to be completed (Appendix C). They distributed two copies of the Informed Consent Form (Appendix D) and had it signed. One was returned directly to the research director and kept in a secure file in his office. The second copy was retained by the participants in the event they might want to contact either the research director or the researcher for further information about the project or to withdraw.

The sibling questionnaire (Appendix E) provided space for the respondent to list the siblings in his/her family, as well as other demographic data including age of siblings, and previous marriages. Next they completed the Marital Adjustment Test (Appendix A). On the Sibling Questionnaire and the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test the respondent provided a 9-digit alpha-numeric code, by which that data could be retrieved and withdrawn if they so desired. The Sibling Questionnaire and the LWMAT were returned under separate cover to this author and kept in a secure file. The methods and procedures were approved by of the Human Subjects Committee (Appendix F).

Data

Data were recorded about the sibling constellation of the respondent. This included the sex of each brother and sister and the age or year of birth. If

Table 3.

Demographic Information about the Respondents

All Respondents	Mean Age	37.9
	Standard Deviation	11.01
	Median	37
	Mode	26
Female	Average Age	37.4
Male	Average Age	39.4
Marriage Length	Mean	12.8
	Standard Deviation	11.22
	Shortest	5 @ 1 month
	Longest	50 years
	Median	10
	Mode	1
Age at Beginning	Mean	25.1
of Current Marriage	Standard Deviation	6.44
	Median	23
	Mode	23
Age at Beginning	Mean	23.5
of Current Marriage	Standard Deviation	4.86
(Married Once)	Median	23
	Mode	22

they were not listed in order of birth, this was done to determine the sibling constellation pattern. The same sibling information was recorded for the spouse of the respondent, then the degree of complementarity was determined. This, along with the composite score on the LWMAT was used to address the major research question. On the sibling questionnaire the respondents recorded the beginning and ending dates of their marriages, which yielded the number of marriages and the length, used to investigate the two additional research questions.

Levinger (1965), in his reconsideration of Toman's hypotheses, completely eliminated only children from his study--those in the third degree of complementarity. Toman (1965) commented: "I regret that the authors have omitted cases of only children, step-siblings, broken homes and missing information (p. 146). In his rejoinder, Levinger (1965) retorts that "such cases *must* be omitted in order to make a pure test of his rank and sex dissimilarity hypotheses" (p. 148).

Locke-Wallace
Marital Adjustment Test

Reliability

The original test had a reliability coefficient of .90, calculated by the split-half technique and corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula. In a study with 66 married couples, the correlation between the original and the revised, unweighted scale was .92 for the wives and .94 for the husbands (Spanier, 1976). In a 1972 letter to the editor of the Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy, Spanier says that he re-calculated the original reliability coef-

ficient of .90 "using the average inter-item formula derived from the Spearman-Brown correction" (p. 403) and found a coefficient of .77. "Using the Cronbach-Alpha estimate, a coefficient of .73 was found" (p. 403). Test-retest reliability was stable over a 2-year interval (Kimmel and van der Veen, 1974).

Validity

A measure of validity was achieved by matching couples who were in therapy, seeking therapy, or in the process of divorce matched by age and sex with the same number of couples who were judged by friends who knew them well to be very well-adjusted to each other in marriage (Locke & Wallace, 1959). The validity study was done using the older, weighted, scoring system, and in that version:

> Only 17 percent of the maladjusted group achieved adjustment scores of 100 or higher, whereas 96 percent of the well-adjusted group achieved scores of 100 or more. . . . The test clearly differentiates between persons who are well-adjusted and those who are maladjusted in marriage. It is evident, therefore, that the test has validity, since it seems to measure what it purports to measure--namely, marital adjustment. (Locke & Wallace, 1959, p. 255)

Scoring

The test yields a composite score which will be used in testing the hypothesis and in the statistical analysis. The original weighted scoring of the test, as reflected in the paragraph above, was incorporated without question, with the assumption that the weights attached to the items were appropriate (Hunt, 1978). An unweighted scoring system was developed by Spanier in

1976, and the current version has a range of 0-60 which is scored as shown in Appendix G (Fredman and Sherman, 1987).

Research Design and Analysis of the Data

The design of this study was descriptive, using a self-report measure, aimed at showing an association and testing for significance. This applied to all six questions and the related hypotheses. For question one about scores on the marital adjustment test and the three degrees or levels of complementarity, scores were divided into three groups depending on the degree of complementarity. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run to test the significance of the differences in composite marital adjustment score means for each group (Huck, Cormier, & Bounds, 1974). The null hypothesis, that there would be no significant difference in the test score means, was tested. The second question paralleled the first. The only difference was the determination of the degrees of complementarity. For hypothesis two, the five year rule was disregarded.

The third question was about the number of marriages, depending on the degree of complementarity. Since the numbers were very small for two, three, and four marriages, the cells were collapsed into two groups: one marriage and two or more marriages and a 3 x 2 Chi^2 table was used to determine the strength of association between the number of marriages and the degree of complementarity. The marriage groups then became: (a) one and (b) more than one. Hypothesis four addressed the same concern as three, ignoring the five year rule.

The length of marriage was the fifth question to be addressed. Data from the respondents were separated, by degree of complementarity, into three groups. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run to test the significance of the differences in the average length of marriage for each group (Huck, Cormier, & Bounds, 1974). The null hypothesis, that there would be no significant difference in the average length of marriage, was tested. The sixth question paralleled the fifth. The only difference was the determination of the degrees of complementarity. For hypothesis six, the five year rule was disregarded. The data were entered into two separate programs, EXCEL and SAS, and the results compared to insure accuracy.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Complementarity as Indicated by Scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test

Hypothesis One

The question of the first hypothesis was whether there were significant differences in marital adjustment scores depending on the degree of complementarity. The null hypothesis was that the means of the test scores will be the same for those in all three degrees or categories of complementarity. In the rare cases where the reverse side of the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test was overlooked and left blank, the mean of each missing item was used in order to obtain a composite score for every respondent. Overall results were as follows: mean, 43.4; standard deviation, 8.08.

Test scores were sorted into three groups depending on the degree of complementarity. Means for the test were calculated by degree of consanguinity, and the results are presented in Table 4. Two of the means were identical and a one-way ANOVA was run to test the significance of the differences in composite test score means for each group. Results can be found in Table 5. With a probability of 0.3368, the null hypothesis was accepted, and the first hypothesis that there would be no significant differences in the test score means for those in the different degrees of complementarity was substantiated.

Table 4.

Scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test by Degree of Complementarity, with the Five Year Rule Applied

Degree	Mean	Standard Deviation
First	42.7	7.72
Second	44.0	8.27
Third	42.7	8.30

Table 5.

ANOVA Summary Table for Comparing Degree of Marital Configuration to Composite Scores on the LWMAT, Using the Five Year Rule

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Probability>F
Between	2	142.78	71.391	1.09	0.3368
Within	251	16392.43	65.308		
Total	253	16535.21			

Hypothesis Two

The question of the second hypothesis was whether there were significant differences in marital adjustment scores depending on the degree of complementarity, if the five year rule were not applied. The null hypothesis was, with the five year rule disregarded: the means of the test scores will be the same for those in all three degrees or categories of complementarity. Test scores were sorted into three groups depending on the

35

degree of complementarity. Means for the test were calculated by degree of consanguinity, and the results are presented in Table 6. A one-way ANOVA was run to test the significance of the differences in composite test score means for each group. Results can be found in Table 7. With a probability of 0.2992, the null hypothesis was accepted, and the second hypothesis, that with the five year rule disregarded, there would be no significant differences in the test score means for those in the different degrees of complementarity was substantiated.

Table 6.

Scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test by Degree of Complementarity, with the Five Year Rule Disregarded

Degree	Mean	Standard Deviation
First	44.2	7.80
Second	44.4	7.81
Third	42.7	8.35

Table 7.

ANOVA Summary Table for Comparing Degree of Marital Configuration to Composite Scores on the LWMAT, with the Five Year Rule Disregarded

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Probability>F
Between	2	159.82	79.910	1.21	0.2992
Within	248	16342.54	65.897		
Total	250	16502.36			

36

Complementarity and the Number of Marriages

Hypothesis Three

The third question asked whether there was an association between the various degrees of complementarity and the number of marriages. The null hypothesis was that the number of marriages would be the same for those in all three degrees of complementarity. Since the numbers were very small for two, three, and four marriages, the cells were collapsed into two groups: one marriage and two or more marriages. A 3 x 2 Chi^2 table was used to determine whether the number of marriages was associated with the degree of complementarity. A Chi^2 value of 0.46 with a probability of 0.79 was found, therefore, the null hypothesis that the number of marriages would be the same for those in all three degrees of complementarity was not rejected. The count of the number of marriages is presented in Table 8.

Table 8.

Number of Marriages by Degree of Complementarity Used in Hypothesis Three, with the Five Year Rule Applied

Degree of Complementarity	One Marriage	Two or More Marriages
First	28	8
Second	62	13
Third	117	25

Hypothesis Four

The question asked whether there was an association between the various degrees of complementarity and the number of marriages, disregarding the five year rule. The null hypothesis was that, without the five year rule, the number of marriages will be the same for those in all three degrees of complementarity. Since the numbers were very small for two, three, and four marriages, as they were in the third hypothesis, the cells were collapsed into two groups: one marriage and two or more marriages. A 3 x 2 Chi^2 table was used to determine whether the number of marriages was associated with the degree of complementarity. A Chi^2 value of 0.43 with a probability of 0.81 was found, therefore, the null hypothesis that the number of marriages would be the same for those in all three degrees of complementarity was not rejected. The count of the number of marriages is presented in Table 9.

Table 9.

Number of Marriages by Degree of Complementarity Used in Hypothesis Four, with the Five Year Rule Disregarded

Degree of Complementarity	One Marriage	Two or More Marriages
First	53	14
Second	118	21
Third	36	11

Complementarity and the Length of Marriages

Hypothesis Five

The question asked whether there was an association between the various degrees of complementarity and the length of a marriage. The null hypothesis was that the length of marriage will be the same for those in all three degrees of complementarity. The data were divided into three groups, depending on the degree of complementarity. The mean length of marriage was calculated for each group. Results are presented in Table 10. A one-way ANOVA was run to test the significance of the differences in means of the length of marriage for each group. Results can be found in Table 11. With a probability of 0.2102, the null hypothesis was accepted, and hypothesis five that there would be no significant differences in the average length of marriage for those in the different degrees of complementarity was substantiated.

Table 10.

Number and Average Length of Marriage by Degree of Complementarity, with the Five Year Rule Applied

Degree	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
First	67	11.3	10.56
Second	137	12.8	11.07
Third	47	15.1	12.38

Table 11.

ANOVA Summary Table for Comparing Degree of Marital Configuration to Average Length of Marriage, with the Five Year Rule Applied

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Probability>F
Between	2	393.36	196.678	1.57	0.2102
Within	248	31081.13	125.327		
Total	250	31474.48			

Hypothesis Six

Hypothesis six, about the duration or length of marriages, disregarding the five year rule, paralleled hypothesis five. The null hypothesis was that the length of marriage will be the same for those in all three degrees of complementarity, with the five year rule disregarded. The data were divided into three groups, depending on the degree of complementarity. The mean length of marriage was calculated for each group. Results are presented in Table 12. A one-way ANOVA was run to test the significance of the differences in means of the length of marriage for each group. Results can be found in Table 13. With a probability of 0.7647, the null hypothesis was accepted, and hypothesis five that there would be no significant differences in the average length of marriage for those in the different degrees of complementarity, disregarding the five year rule, was substantiated.

Table 12.

Number and Average Length of Marriage by Degree of Complementarity, with the Five Year Rule Disregarded

Degree	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
First	36	12.1	11.77
Second	73	12.3	11.21
Third	142	13.3	11.14

Table 13.

ANOVA Summary Table for Comparing Degree of Marital Configuration to Average Length of Marriage, with the Five Year Rule Disregarded

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Probability>F
Between	2	68.03	34.017	0.27	0.7647
Within	248	31406.45	126.639		
Total	250	31474.48			

Summary

These are the results of the statistical analyses applied to test the hypotheses, which were formulated in response to individual questions about marital adjustment. These three questions were founded on Toman's tests that successful marriages would be reflected by better adjustment, few remarriages, and greater duration. The first of each pair followed Toman's five year rule in determining the degrees of complementarity. The counterpart disregarded that five year rule and examined the same questions.

The responses to each item on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test were tabulated by degree of complementarity of the respondent. This was done with the five year rule in effect and without it. Data on the individual items are presented in Appendix H along with the topic that each test item addresses.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Complementarity and Marital Satisfaction as Indicated by Composite Scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test

Toman (1961) predicted that those in the first degree of complementarity would be the most likely to be "happy and successful" (p. 6) in their marriage. Those in the second degree would be less "happy and successful." and those in the third degree would be the least "happy and successful" of all. To test this, the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test (LWMAT) was administered and scored. The first null hypothesis stated that the means of the marital adjustment test scores will be the same for those in all three degrees of complementarity. An examination of the means, in Table 14, reveals that two of the group means, for those in the first and third degrees of

Table 14.
Scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test by Degree of Complementarity, with and without the Five Year Rule

Five Year Rule	With	Without	With	Without
Degree	Mean	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Deviation
First	42.7	44.2	7.72	7.80
Second	44.0	44.4	8.27	7.81
Third	42.7	42.7	8.30	8.35
Total	43.13	43.77		

complementarity are exactly the same, and those in the second degree were 1.3 points higher, which was not statistically significant. Those couples in the third degree include one partner, or both, who are only children and have no previous sibling relationships to build upon. Testing revealed that the "ideal" couples of the first degree, score exactly the same as those of the third degree. Toman's theory, therefore, does not seem to stand up to the rigorous test of a standardized instrument, long used to empirically measure marital adjustment.

To determine whether classifying couples without the five year rule would have any effect on LWMAT scores the data were re-sorted and the statistical tests run again with the revised classifications in effect. These results are compared with those imposing the five year rule in Table 14. Those in the third degree of complementarity showed no change in the mean scores. When the five year rule was not applied, the mean of the composite scores was higher, that is, the couples reported a higher level of marital adjustment. The five year rule is arbitrary. There is no basis for it in empirical research. All siblings should be considered as a unit. There is no reason for holding the position that just because a brother or sister is more than five years older or younger than yourself, he or she had no influence on "the system of interpersonal relationships he found in his family" (Stotland, Sherman, and Shaver, 1971, p. 47).

The following are two disguised examples, taken from the respondent data, of couples that fall into the third degree of complementarity. A man from Tennessee, 42 years old, had three older sisters, aged 53, 56, and 59. Because of the age difference between himself and his sisters, he was

artificially classified as an only child, with no experience relating to females other than his mother. In another case, a woman from Kentucky, 30 years old, had two older sisters, 39 and 48, and an older brother, 44. The presumption was made by Toman that she is to be deemed as having no sibling familiarity with brothers or sisters because of an arbitrary age difference.

Complementarity and the Number of Marriages

Was there an association between the various degrees of complementarity and the number of marriages? The null hypothesis was: the number of marriages will be the same for those in the three degrees of complementarity. The results of the Chi^2 test show clearly that no association exists between the number of marriages and complementarity. Toman's hypothesis that those in the first degree would have a better marriage, as judged by the number of marriages, is not supported by the data collected in this study. An examination of the figures in Table 10 reveal that 82% of those in the third degree of complementarity had one marriage, while only 78% of those in the first degree had one marriage. When the five year rule was disregarded, those with the highest percentage of one marriage were in the second degree. The current data support the hypothesis that there is no relationship between degree of complementarity and marital adjustment as reflected by the number of marriages. In Table 15 is a comparison of the number of marriages for each degree of complementarity using each method of classification.

Table 15.

Number of Marriages by Degree of Complementarity Used in Hypotheses Three and Four, with the Five Year Rule Applied and Disregarded

Five Year Rule	With	Without	With	Without
Degree	One Marriage	One Marriage	Two or More Marriages	Two or More Marriages
First	28	53	8	14
Second	62	118	13	21
Third	117	36	25	11

Complementarity and the Length of Marriage

Was there an association between the various degrees of complementarity and the length of a marriage? It follows logically from Toman's theory that those who have a greater degree of complementarity in their marriage would stay married longer than those who do not. The figures presented in Table 16 clearly show that with the five year rule in force, those in the second degree of complementarity had longer marriages than those in the first degree, and the couples in the third degree had the longest marriages of all. When the five year rule was disregarded, the third degree category again had the longest marriages, and the three degrees were more equal.

Table 16.

Average Length of Marriage by Degree of Complementarity, with and without the Five Year Rule

Five Year Rule	With	Without	With	Without
Degree	Mean	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Deviation
First	11.3	12.1	10.56	11.77
Second	12.8	12.3	11.07	11.21
Third	15.1	13.3	12.38	11.14

Marital Adjustment and Culture

The studies of Kemper (1966) and Weller, Natan, and Hazi (1975) yielded identical results, yet they were done with subjects from two different cultures. Toman conducted his research with German couples and his findings were not the same as the current study with United States subjects. Could marital adjustment be culturally biased? The standard of cooperation, as put forth by Adler (1931), might only be found in German villages, such as the ones where Toman would have drawn his sample, which could be a uniquely German trait.

Perhaps there is an answer to marital adjustment in the culture of an uncomplicated, simple African tribal village (Mkhize, 1990). In the event of a dissatisfaction between a husband and a wife, the emphasis is on a quick resolution, a speedy intervention, and this is accomplished by those who

were both physically and relationally proximate. A parallel in size can be drawn between Adler's village where there is an uncomplicated culture, and Mkhize's tribal village. In both cases, marriages are under the close scrutiny of family, friends, and neighbors. In the United States a married couple can live in a community for years without any community attachments, by which attitudes, problems, and adjustments are monitored. A cultural phenomenon in the United States is divorce. The rate of divorce was 4.7 per thousand in 1989 (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1991) and for the sample of the current group it was 1.8 per thousand. It is the premise of this author that it is the very character of our culture that isolates individuals and couples, and that no study done with a totally different population can withstand the rigor of generalization to our own and be valid.

Age and Marital Adjustment

The current study appears to have some bias. Many of the respondents were older persons, married for a long time. Eighty-one percent of them were married only once, showing a good deal of marital adjustment. When respondents were solicited, through the university students, they probably send the questionnaire to those people they regarded as well-adjusted in their marriage, even though they were not instructed to. When those in the community were contacted, no one was chosen who had been seen arguing or fighting. Parents of teenagers were selected who had good relations with their children. Unintentionally, subjects were chosen who were most likely to be among the best adjusted persons available. Composite marital adjustment scores do reflect this bias. With a possible range of 0 - 60, the five highest

scores were 56, 57, 57, 58, and 59. The five lowest scores were 6, 13, 15, 20, and 23. The mode for all scores was 45.

The research done by Toman and Gray in 1961 revealed a clear distinction in the effects of complementarity when comparing "normal" with "disturbed" couples, at a ration of over 3 to 1. The current study did not seek "disturbed" couples, and that did not diminish the results of the findings, that there was no association between complementarity and adjustment or number or length of marriages.

Conclusion and Recommendations for Further Research

The conclusion from the present study is that the structure of the family of origin has no relationship with current marital adjustment. Dissatisfaction in or with a marriage can not be overcome by knowing the gender and number of one's siblings. The current study shows that there is no relationship between marital adjustment and degree of complementarity, and that it does not matter whether the five year rule is imposed or not. The results are consistent with those obtained by Levinger and Sonnheim (1965) and further corroborate the work of Vos and Hayden (1985).

The results of the present study were inconsistent with those found by Toman (1962), when he matched 16 couples married for ten years or more with 16 divorced couples, which gives an unfair advantage to marital adjustment. Those who were married the longest should have the best adjustment, and those who were already divorced should have the worst. Even with the same imbalance in their groups, the research done by

Birtchnell and Mayhew (1977) failed to support Toman's theory. The current findings show that across all degrees of complementarity, marital adjustment scores, which include happiness, are almost equal.

In a counseling setting, when couples present with marital adjustment problems, one area that need not be investigated is birth order and sibling constellation--it makes no difference. There may be a reason for marital discord, but it surely does not lie in the number and gender of siblings with which one was raised. Birth order, as a factor in marital adjustment, must be eliminated. This researcher recommends longitudinal studies like that of Kelly and Conley (1987) in which reasons for enduring, stable, well-adjusted marriages were found. These data should then form the basis of counselor education course content, focusing on the counseling of couples showing signs of marital discord.

REFERENCES

References

Adler, A. (1930). The education of children. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company.

Adler, A. (1958). What life should mean to you. New York: Capricorn Books. (Original work published 1931)

Arnold, K. D. & McKenry, P. C. (1986). Divorce and the mid-life transition: Some preliminary findings. Journal of Divorce, 9, 55-63.

Bank, S. P. & Kahn, M. D. (1982). The Sibling Bond. New York: Basic Books.

Birtchnell, J. (1974). Some possible early family determinants of marriage and divorce. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 47, 121-127.

Birtchnell, J. & Mayhew, J. (1977). Toman's theory: Tested for mate selection and friendship formation. Journal of Individual Psychology, 33, 18-36.

Black, D. R. (1982). Developing a couples application form to predict weight loss success. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Bloser, E. C. (1988). [Marital adjustment and birth order: A preliminary study]. Unpublished raw data.

Boor, M. & Bair, J. H. (1990). Suicide rates, handgun control laws, and sociodemographic variables. Psychological Reports, 66, 923-930.

Bowen, M. (1978). Family Therapy in Clinical Practice. New York: Jason Aronson.

Brackney, B. E. (1979). The impact of home dialysis on the marital dyad. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 5, 55-60.

Butler, J. F. & Crane, D. R. (1980). Self-report schedules for use in assessing the marital adjustment of abusive and nonabusive parents. American Journal of Family Therapy, 8, 29-34.

Campbell, L., White, J., & Stewart, A. (1991). The relationship of psychological birth order to actual birth order. Individual Psychology--Journal of Adlerian Theory, Research and Practice, 47, 380-391.

Chiriboga, D. A., Catron, L. S., and Associates (1991). Divorce: Crisis, Challenge or Relief? New York: New York University Press.

Coleman, R. E. & Miller, A. G. (1975). The relationship between depression and marital maladjustment in a clinic population: A multitrait-multimethod study. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43. 647-651.

Cook, N. I. (1979). An analysis of marital and infant factors in evolving family relationships. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, San Francisco, CA.

Davis, B. & Aron, A. (1988). Perceived causes of divorce and post-divorce adjustment among recently divorced midlife women. Journal of Divorce, 12, 41-55.

Davis, G. & Murch, M. (1988). Grounds for Divorce. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dudley, M. G. & Kosinski, F. A. Jr. (1990). Religiosity and marital satisfaction: A research note. Review of Religious Research, 32, 78-86.

Dunn, N. J., Jacob, T., Hummon, N., & Seilhamer, R. A. (1987). Marital stability in alcoholic-spouse relationships as a function of drinking pattern and location. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 96, 99-107.

Epstein, N. (1984). Depression and marital dysfunction: Cognitive and behavioral linkages. International Journal of Mental Health, 13, 86-104.

Ernst, C., & Angst, J. (1983). Birth order: Its influence on personality. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Forer, L. K. (1969). Birth order and life roles. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Forer, L. K. (1976). The birth order factor: How your personality is influenced by your place in the family. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Fredman, N. & Sherman, R. (1987). Handbook of measurements for marriage and family therapy. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Gabbard, G. O., Menninger, R. W., & Coyne, L. (1987). Sources of conflict in the medical marriage. American Journal of Psychiatry, 144, 567- 572.

Glendon, M. A. (1987). Abortion and Divorce in Western Law. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Greenhaus, J. H., Bedeian, A. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1987). Work experience, job performance, and feelings of personal and family well-being. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31, 200-215.

Grover, K. J., Russell, C. S., Schumm, W. R., & Paff-Bergen, L. A. (1985). Mate selection processes and marital satisfaction. Family Relations--Journal of Applied Family and Child Studies, 34, 383-386.

Hall, C. S., Lindzey, G., Loehlin, J. C., & Manosevitz, M. (1985). Introduction to Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Hiller, D. V. & Philliber, W. W. (1986). The division of labor in contemporary marriage: Expectations, perceptions, and performance. Social Problems, 33, 191-201.

Huck, S. W., Cormier, W. H., & Bounds, W. G. Jr. (1974). Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper & Row.

Hunt, R. A. (1978). The effect of item weighting on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40, 249-255.

Iwanir, S. & Ayal, H. (1991). Midlife divorce initiation: From crisis to developmental transition. Contemporary Family Therapy--An International Journal, 13, 609-623.

Kaffman, M., Elizur, E., Shoham, S., & Gilead-Roelofs, N. (1989). Divorce in the kibbutz: Determinants of breakup. Journal of Divorce, 13, 159-184.

Kelly, E. L. & Conley, J. J. (1987). Personality and compatibility: A prospective analysis of marital stability and marital satisfaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 27-40.

Kemper, T. D. (1966). Mate selection and marital satisfaction according to sibling type of husband and wife. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28, 346-349.

Kimmel, D. & van der Veen, F. (1974). Factors of marital adjustment in Locke's Marital Adjustment Test. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 57-63.

Konig, K. (1963). Brothers and sisters: A study in child psychology. Blauvelt, New York: St. George Books.

Krokoff, L. J. (1989). Predictive validation of a telephone version of the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51, 767-775.

Lehman, K. (1992). More about relationships: Even more is relative than we ever thought it was. Bottom Line Personal, 13, 11-12.

Levinger, G. (1965). Complementarity in marital adjustment: Rejoinder. Journal of Individual Psychology, 21, 147-148.

Levinger, G. (1966). Sources of marital dissatisfaction among applicants for divorce. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 36, 803-807.

Levinger, G. & Sonnheim, M. (1965). Complementarity in marital adjustment: Reconsidering Toman's family constellation hypothesis. Journal of Individual Psychology, 21, 137-145.

Locke, H. J. & Wallace, K. M. (1959). Short marital-adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 21, 251-255.

Maneker, J. S. & Rankin, R. P. (1991). Religious affiliation and marital duration among those who file for divorce in California. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 15, 205-218.

Merikangas, K. R., Prusoff, B. A., & Kupfer, D. J. (1985). Marital adjustment in major depression. Journal of Affective Disorders, 9, 5-11.

Meyer, J. P. & Pepper, S. (1977). Need compatibility and marital adjustment in young married couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 331-342.

Mkhize, P. (1990). Conflict resolution: An African style. Family and Conciliation Courts Review, 28, 71-72.

Myers, J. C. (1979). Fundamentals of Experimental Design (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn, Bacon.

Pasley, K., Thinger-Tallman, M., & Coleman, C. (1984). Family Relations--Journal of Applied Family and Child Studies, 33, 451-457.

Pinsky, H. J. (1975). The effect of sibling constellation on mate-selection. Dissertation Abstracts International, 74, 3031B-3032B.

Plechaty, M. (1989). L'effet de la satisfaction residentielle sur l'adaptation conjugale. Revue Quebecoise de Psychologie, 10, 82-92.

Rabin, C., Margolin, G., Safir, M., & Talovic, S. (1986). The areas of change questionnaire: A cross-cultural comparison of Israel and American distressed and nondistressed couples. American Journal of Family Therapy, 14, 324-335.

Roberts, M. C., Floyd, F. J., O'Farrell, T. J., & Cutter, H. S. (1985). Marital interactions and the duration of alcoholic husbands' sobriety. American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 11, 303-313.

Sabatelli, R. M. (1982). Personality and marriage: Cognitive style and locus of control as mediators of marital complaints. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Washington, DC.

Sabatelli, R. M. (1988). Measurement issues in marital research: A review and critique of contemporary survey instruments. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 891-915.

Schaughnecy, E. A. & Lahey, B. B. (1985). Mothers' and fathers' perceptions of child deviance: Roles of child behavior, parental depression, and marital satisfaction. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53, 718-723.

Schaupp, D. S. (1985). Sex-role concepts, marital adjustment, and self-actualization in long-term marriages. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

Schumm, W. R. & Bugaihis, M. A. (1986). Marital quality over the marital career: Alternative explanations. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 165-168.

Schumm, W. R., Paff-Bergen, L. A., Hatch, R. C., Obiorah, F. C., Copeland, J. M., Meens, L. D., & Buraighis, M. A. (1986). Concurrent and discriminant validity of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 381-387.

Spanier, G. B. (1972). Further evidence on methodological weaknesses in the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale and other measures of adjustment. [Letter to the editor]. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34, 403-404.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 15-28.

Spanier, G. B. & Margolis, R. L. (1983). Marital separation and extra-marital sexual behavior. Journal of Sex Research, 19, 23-48.

Sporakowski, M. J. & Hughston, G. A. (1978). Prescriptions for happy marriage: Adjustments and satisfactions of couples married for 50 or more years. Family Coordinator, 27, 321-327.

Stotland, E., Sherman, S. E., & Shaver, K. G. (1971). Empathy and birth order: Some experimental explorations. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Sutton-Smith, B. & Rosenberg, B. G. (1970). The sibling. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Terman, L. M. (1938). Psychological factors in marital happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Thompson, C. L. & Rudolph, L. B. (1992). Counseling Children (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Tiggel, R. B., Peters, M. D., Kelley, H. H., & Vincent J. (1982). Correlational and discrepancy indices of understanding and their relation to marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 209-215.

Toman, W. (1959). Family constellation as a basic personality determinant. Journal of Individual Psychology, 15, 199-211.

Toman, W. (1960). An introduction to psychoanalytic theory of motivation. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Toman, W. (1961). Family constellation. New York: Springer.

Toman, W. (1962). Family constellations of the partners in divorced and married couples. Journal of Individual Psychology, 18, 48-51.

Toman, W. (1965). Complementarity in marital adjustment: Comment. Journal of Individual Psychology, 21, 145-146.

Toman, W. (1969). Family constellation: Its effects on personality and social behavior (2nd ed.). New York: Springer.

Toman, W. (1970). Never mind your horoscope, birth order rules all. Psychology Today. 45-69.

Toman, W. (1976). Family constellation: Its effects on personality and social behavior (3rd ed.). New York: Springer.

Toman, W. (1988). Family Therapy and Sibling Position. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson.

Toman, W. & Gray, B. (1961). Family constellations of "normal" and "disturbed" marriages: An empirical study. Journal of Individual Psychology, 17, 93-95.

U. S. Bureau of the Census (1991). Statistical abstract of the United States: 1991 (111th ed.). Washington: U. S. Bureau of the Census.

U. S. Bureau of the Census (1992). U. S. census of population and housing, 1990: Summary tape file 1C prepared by the Bureau of the Census (machine-readable data file). Washington: U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Vaughan, D. (1986). Uncoupling: Turning Points in Intimate Relationships. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vos, C. J. V., & Hayden, D. J. (1985). Birth order complementarity and marital adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47, 723-727.

Waldron, H. & Routh, D. K. (1981). The effect of the first child on the marital relationship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 785-788.

Weller, L., Hazi, O., & Natan, O. (1974). Birth order and marital bliss in Israel. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 794-797.

Weller, L., Hazi, O., & Natan, O. (1975). Birth order and the feminine sex role of married women. Journal of Individual Psychology, 31, 65-70.

White, L. K. & Booth, A. (1991). Divorce over the life course: The rule of marital happiness. Journal of Family Issues, 12, 5-21.

White, M. B. (1990). A comparison of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale and the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test. Paper presented at the

annual conference of the National Conference on Family Relations, Seattle, WA.

Wilson, B. F. (1991). The marry-go-round: Statistics on marriage, divorce, death. American Demographics, 13, 52-54.

Yang, B. & Lester, D. (1991). Correlates of statewide divorce rates. Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 15, 219-223.

Yelsma, P. (1984). Marital communication, adjustment and perceptual differences between "happy" and "counseling" couples. American Journal of Family Therapy, 12, 26-36.

Young, J. L. & Griffith, E. E. (1991). Understanding due discretion of judgment in Catholic marriage courts. Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 19, 109-118.

Zevon, M. A. (1986). Differential impact of medical status, maternal coping, and marital satisfaction on coping with childhood cancer. Paper presented at the annual Society of Behavioral Medicine Scientific Sessions, San Francisco, CA

Ziegler, B. L. (1982). The relationship of sex roles and marital adjustment. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Sacramento, CA.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Marital Adjustment Test

1. Circle the dot on the scale line below that best fits the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present marriage. The middle point, "Happy," represents the degree of happiness that most people get from their marriage, and the scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are unhappy in marriage, and on the other, to those few who experience extreme joy in their marriage.

• • • • • • •

Very Unhappy — Happy — Perfectly Happy

Circle the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your mate on the following items:

1 Always Agree	2 Almost Always Agree	3 Occasionally Disagree	4 Frequently Disagree	5 Almost Always Disagree	6 Always Disagree

2. Handling Family Finances	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Matters of Recreation	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Demonstrations of Affection	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Friends	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Sex Relations	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Conventionality (right, good, or proper conduct)	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Philosophy of Life	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Ways of dealing with in-laws	1	2	3	4	5	6

10. When disagreements arise, they usually result in:

____ husband giving in
____ wife giving in
____ agreement by mutual give and take

11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?

____ all of them
____ some of them
____ very few of them
____ none of them

12-a. In leisure time do you generally prefer to:

____ be on the go
____ stay at home

12-b. In leisure time does your mate generally prefer to:

____ be on the go
____ stay at home

13. Do you ever wish you had not married?

____ frequently
____ occasionally
____ rarely
____ never

14. If you had your life to live over, do you think you would:

____ marry the same person
____ marry a different person
____ not marry at all

15. Do you confide in your mate:

____ almost never
____ rarely
____ in most things
____ in everything

Appendix B

Representation from Each State in Descending Order of Number

State	Number
Tennessee	135
New York	12
Kentucky	10
Alabama	8
Georgia	8
Illinois	7
Michigan	7
North Carolina	6
Ohio	6
District of Columbia	5
California	4
Florida	4
Louisiana	4
Texas	4
Virginia	4
Arkansas	3
Indiana	3
Massachusetts	3
New Jersey	3
South Carolina	3
Kansas	2
Minnesota	2
West Virginia	2
Wyoming	2
Connecticut	1
Iowa	1
Missouri	1
Nebraska	1
South Dakota	1
Missing	2
Total	254

Appendix C

ADMINISTERING THE MARITAL ADJUSTMENT TEST

1. Who may participate? Any person who says he/she is married. Couples may participate separately. Should you have any couples, a note on their forms (but not Informed Consent Forms) would be helpful.

2. Start with these items:

Informed Consent Form (two copies)
Myself and My Brothers and Sisters
Marital Adjustment Test (two sides)

3. Give the participants a copy of the Informed Consent Form. Let them read it. If they agree to participate they complete the bottom of the Informed Consent Form and return it to you. You give them the other copy of the Informed Consent Form to keep.

4. Next they complete the list of themselves and their brothers and sisters. The goal is to list siblings, including themselves, in order of age. The participant may provide either the year they and their brothers and sisters were born, or their ages this year. They do the same for their spouse and his/her brothers and sisters.

5. The control number is one that the participant makes up. You may suggest that they use their social security number or their date of birth. Too many people have used "007" and then it needs to be changed to make it a unique identification number. That number is how the data will be stored in the computer.

6. Finally, the participant completes the Marital Adjustment Test. Question one should be answered after they read the description of "Happy" in the first paragraph. There are more questions on the back of the Marital Adjustment Test. Use the same control number as on the previous information sheet.

7. Keep the consent forms separate from the information sheet and test. They are not to be linked together in any way. The researcher will have no idea who the subjects are who participate in the study.

Appendix D

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

This study is researching the effect that the birth order of each partner has on their degree of marital adjustment. You are asked to complete: a form listing your position in your original family; that of your partner; a personal demographics form; and the 15-item Marital Adjustment Test. The risks involved in participating in this research are minimal and no greater than those encountered in the everyday life of a person in a marital relationship. This study will help determine the correlation between the birth order of partners and marital adjustment.

Your identity will be kept confidential. Any results will be presented in aggregate form, with no identification of the individual participants. Your name will appear only on this informed consent form, and all other papers will have a code number assigned by and known only to you. The consent forms will be secured in a locked office inside Room 108 Claxton Education Building. The others will be secured in a locked office inside Room 103 of the same building. The project director will have exclusive access to the forms. The researcher will see only the coded forms. If you have questions about the research contact either person listed below. You may keep the second copy of this form for your records. Participation is voluntary, and you may decline to take part or discontinue at any time without penalty.

Project Director:
Charles L. Thompson, PhD
116 Claxton Education Building
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-3400
(615) 974-5131

Researcher:
Edward C. Bloser, MEd
108 Claxton Education Building
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-3400
(615) 974-5131

I have read and understood the explanation of this study and agree to participate.

_____

Signature Date

_____

Printed Name

CONTROL NUMBER _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

MYSELF AND MY BROTHERS AND SISTERS

Mark yourself with an X	Male or Female	Year of Birth or Age in 1992	

MY SPOUSE'S BROTHERS AND SISTERS

Mark your spouse with an X	Male or Female	Year of Birth or Age in 1992	

MY MARRIAGES

From _____ To _____

From _____ To _____

From _____ To _____

From _____ To _____

Where were you born?

68

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE

Research Administration
Compliances
Grants & Contracts
Proposal Development Services
404 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-0140
(615) 974-3466
FAX (615) 974-2805

DATE: 09/03/92

CRP #: 2757 A

Title: The Relationship between Birth Order and Marital Adjustment

Bloser, Edward C.
Educational & Counseling Pysch
108 Claxton Ed. Bldg.
Campus

Thompson, Dr. Charles L.
Educational & Counseling Pysch
108 Claxton Ed. Bldg.
Campus

This is to notify you that your request for renewal with no change in protocol of the above-captioned project has been approved.

This approval is for a period ending one year from the date of this letter. Please make timely submission of renewal or prompt notification of project termination (see item #3 below).

Responsibilities of the investigator during the conduct of this project include the following:

1. To retain signed consent forms from subjects for at least three years following completion of the project.

2. To obtain prior approval from the Committee before instituting any changes in the project (Form D).

3. To submit a Form D at 12-month or less intervals attesting to the current status of the project (protocol is still in effect, changes have been made, project is terminated, etc.)

We wish you continued success in your research endeavor.

Sincerely yours,
Edith M. Szathmary
Edith M. Szathmary
Coordinator of Compliances

cc: Dr. Steve McCallum
108 Claxton Ed. Bldg.

Appendix G

Marital Adjustment Test, with current version of scoring

1. Circle the dot on the scale line below that best fits the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present marriage. The middle point, "Happy" represents the degree of happiness that most people get from their marriage, and the scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are unhappy in marriage, and on the other, to those few who experience extreme joy in their marriage.

• (0) • (1) • (2) • (3) • (4) • (5) • (6)

Very Unhappy — Happy — Perfectly Happy

Circle the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your mate on the following items:

1 Always Agree	2 Almost Always Agree	3 Occasionally Disagree	4 Frequently Disagree	5 Almost Always Disagree	6 Always Disagree
		(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
2. Handling Family Finances		1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Matters of Recreation		1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Demonstrations of Affection		1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Friends		1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Sex Relations		1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Conventionality (right, good, or proper conduct)		1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Philosophy of Life		1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Ways of dealing with in-laws		1	2	3	4	5	6

10. When disagreements arise, they usually result in:
    _(0)_ husband giving in
    _(1)_ wife giving in
    _(2)_ agreement by mutual give and take

11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?
    _(3)_ all of them
    _(2)_ some of them
    _(1)_ very few of them
    _(0)_ none of them

12-a. In leisure time do you generally prefer to:
    ____ be on the go
    ____ stay at home

12-b. In leisure time does your mate generally prefer to:
    ____ be on the go
    ____ stay at home

If 12-a and 12-b are both "on the go" score 1.
If 12-a and 12-b are both "stay at home" score 2.
If 12-a and 12-b disagree, score 0.

13. Do you ever wish you had not married?
    _(0)_ frequently
    _(1)_ occasionally
    _(2)_ rarely
    _(3)_ never

14. If you had your life to live over, do you think you would:
    _(2)_ marry the same person
    _(1)_ marry a different person
    _(0)_ not marry at all

15. Do you confide in your mate:
    _(0)_ almost never
    _(1)_ rarely
    _(2)_ in most things
    _(2)_ in everything

Appendix H

Responses to Question One in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity, with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Happiness.

Degree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Very Unhappy			Happy			Perfectly Happy
First-with	1	0	5	4	7	10	7
Without	1	2	11	10	12	20	9
Percent-with	0.4	0.0	2.0	1.6	2.8	4.0	2.8
Without	0.4	0.8	4.4	4.0	4.8	8.0	3.6
Second-with	1	4	3	14	13	28	13
Without	1	2	11	10	12	20	9
Percent-with	0.4	1.6	1.2	5.6	5.2	11.2	5.2
Without	0.4	0.8	4.4	4.0	4.8	8.0	3.6
Third-with	1	8	16	22	29	44	20
Without	1	4	7	8	8	11	6
Percent-with	0.4	3.2	6.4	8.8	11.6	17.6	8.0
Without	0.4	1.6	2.8	3.2	3.2	4.4	2.4

Appendix H (Continued)

Responses to Question Two in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity, with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Finances.

Degree	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
First-with	4	18	12	2	0	0
Without	51	36	22	3	1	0
Percent-with	1.6	7.1	4.7	1.2	0.0	0.0
Without	2.0	14.2	8.7	1.2	0.4	0.0
Second-with	1	4	3	14	13	28
Without	7	46	20	3	0	0
Percent-with	0.4	1.6	1.2	5.6	5.2	11.2
Without	2.8	18.1	7.9	1.2	0.0	0.0
Third-with	12	72	46	7	4	1
Without	4	23	16	2	2	0
Percent-with	1.6	9.1	6.3	0.8	0.8	0.0
Without	0.4	1.6	2.8	3.2	3.2	4.4

Responses to Question Three in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Recreation.

Degree	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
First-with	6	18	9	2	0	1
Without	8	34	18	5	1	1
Percent-with	2.4	7.1	3.5	0.8	0.0	0.4
Without	3.2	13.4	7.1	2.0	0.4	0.4
Second-with	9	32	24	8	1	2
Without	11	69	41	11	5	3
Percent-with	3.5	12.6	9.5	3.2	0.4	0.8
Without	4.3	27.2	16.1	4.3	2.0	1.2
Third-with	5	76	42	11	6	2
Without	1	23	16	5	1	1
Percent-with	2.0	29.9	16.5	4.3	2.4	0.8
Without	0.4	9.1	6.3	2.0	0.4	0.4

Appendix H (Continued)

Responses to Question Four in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Demonstrations of Affection.

Degree	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
First-with	8	14	10	4	0	0
Without	10	29	17	11	0	0
Percent-with	3.2	5.5	4.0	1.6	0.0	0.0
Without	4.0	11.5	6.7	4.4	0.0	0.0
Second-with	1	39	18	7	0	1
Without	19	69	39	10	1	2
Percent-with	4.4	15.4	7.1	2.8	0.0	0.4
Without	7.5	27.3	15.4	4.0	0.4	0.8
Third-with	17	67	39	14	3	1
Without	7	22	11	4	2	0
Percent-with	6.7	26.5	15.4	5.5	1.2	0.4
Without	2.8	8.7	4.4	1.6	0.8	0.0

Responses to Question Five in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Friends.

Degree	1 Always Agree	2 Almost Always Agree	3 Occasionally Disagree	4 Frequently Disagree	5 Almost Always Disagree	6 Always Disagree
First-with	7	14	12	3	0	0
Without	9	33	18	6	1	0
Percent-with	2.8	5.5	4.7	1.2	0.0	0.0
Without	3.5	13.0	7.1	234	0.4	0.0
Second-with	17	37	18	4	0	0
Without	27	67	38	4	4	0
Percent-with	6.7	14.6	7.1	1.6	0.0	0.0
Without	10.6	26.4	15.0	2.9	2.9	0.0
Third-with	21	75	34	5	6	1
Without	9	26	8	2	1	1
Percent-with	8.3	29.5	13.4	2.0	22.4	0.4
Without	3.5	10.2	3.2	0.8	0.4	0.4

Responses to Question Six in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Sex.

Degree	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
First-with	14	7	13	1	1	0
Without	16	21	22	5	3	0
Percent-with	5.5	2.8	5.1	0.4	0.4	0.0
Without	6.3	8.3	8.7	2.0	1.2	0.0
Second-with	14	36	19	5	1	0
Without	23	62	39	10	5	0
Percent-with	5.5	14.2	7.5	2.0	0.4	0.0
Without	9.1	24.5	15.4	4.0	2.0	0.0
Third-with	21	60	40	12	7	2
Without	10	20	11	3	1	2
Percent-with	8.3	23.7	15.8	4.7	2.8	.8
Without	4.0	7.9	4.4	1.2	0.4	0.8

Appendix H (Continued)

Responses to Question Seven in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Right and Proper Conduct.

Degree	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
First-with	7	17	10	1	0	0
Without	11	30	20	4	1	0
Percent-with	2.8	6.7	4.0	0.4	0.0	0.0
Without	4.4	11.9	7.9	1.6	0.4	0.0
Second-with	17	37	16	5	0	1
Without	29	66	32	9	2	2
Percent-with	6.7	14.6	6.3	2.0	0.0	0.4
Without	11.5	26.1	12.7	3.6	0.8	0.8
Third-with	34	64	30	8	5	1
Without	18	22	4	1	2	0
Percent-with	13.4	25.3	11.9	3.16	2.0	0.4
Without	7.1	8.7	1.6	0.4	0.8	0.0

Appendix H (Continued)

Responses to Question Eight in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Philosophy of Life.

Degree	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
First-with	3	21	10	1	1	0
Without	7	36	16	3	5	0
Percent-with	1.2	8.3	3.9	0.4	0.4	0.0
Without	2.8	14.2	6.3	1.2	2.0	0.0
Second-with	15	37	18	4	1	1
Without	29	62	33	10	4	2
Percent-with	5.9	14.6	7.1	1.6	0.4	0.4
Without	11.4	24.4	13.0	3.9	1.6	0.8
Third-with	29	56	35	10	10	2
Without	11	16	14	2	3	1
Percent-with	11.4	22.1	13.8	3.9	3.9	0.8
Without	4.3	6.3	5.5	0.8	1.2	0.4

Appendix H (Continued)

Responses to Question Nine in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: In-laws.

Degree	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Always Agree	Almost Always Agree	Occasionally Disagree	Frequently Disagree	Almost Always Disagree	Always Disagree
First-with	4	17	10	2	1	1
Without	8	28	20	6	2	2
Percent-with	1.6	6.7	4.0	0.8	0.4	0.4
Without	3.2	11.1	7.9	2.4	0.8	0.8
Second-with	13	34	21	6	0	2
Without	22	64	39	11	1	3
Percent-with	5.1	13.4	8.3	2.4	0.0	0.8
Without	8.7	25.3	15.4	4.4	0.4	1.2
Third-with	20	63	39	12	6	2
Without	7	22	11	3	4	0
Percent-with	7.9	24.9	15.4	4.7	2.4	0.8
Without	5.8	8.7	4.4	1.2	1.6	0.0

Appendix H (Continued)

Responses to Question Ten in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Disagreements.

Degree	Husband Gives In	Wife Gives In	Mutual Agreement
First-with	2	7	24
Without	8	11	43
Percent-with	0.8	2.9	10.0
Without	3.3	4.6	17.9
Second-with	14	7	51
Without	22	14	99
Percent-with	5.8	2.9	21.3
Without	9.2	5.8	41.3
Third-with	19	18	98
Without	5	7	31
Percent-with	7.9	7.5	40.8
Without	2.1	2.9	12.9

Appendix H (Continued)

Responses to Question Eleven in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Outside Interests.

Degree	All	Some	Very Few	None
First-with	8	19	5	1
Without	11	41	10	1
Percent-with	3.3	7.9	2.1	0.4
Without	4.6	16.9	4.1	0.4
Second-with	7	59	6	0
Without	11	108	14	2
Percent-with	2.9	24.4	2.5	0.0
Without	4.6	44.6	5.8	0.8
Third-with	10	105	20	2
Without	3	34	7	0
Percent-with	4.1	43.4	8.3	0.8
Without	1.2	14.1	2.9	0.0

Appendix H (Continued)

Responses to Question Twelve-a in Percent of Total Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Leisure-Respondent.

Degree	On the Go	Stay at Home
First-with	15	18
Without	32	31
Percent-with	6.2	7.5
Without	13.3	12.9
Second-with	29	43
Without	56	79
Percent-with	12.0	17.8
Without	23.2	32.8
Third-with	65	71
Without	21	22
Percent-with	27.0	29.5
Without	8.7	9.13

Responses to Question Twelve-b in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Leisure-Spouse.

Degree	On the Go	Stay at Home
First-with	14	19
Without	32	31
Percent-with	5.8	7.9
Without	13.2	12.8
Second-with	31	41
Without	54	81
Percent-with	12.8	16.9
Without	22.3	33.5
Third-with	63	74
Without	22	22
Percent-with	26.0	30.6
Without	9.1	9.1

Responses to Question Thirteen in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Not Married.

Degree	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
First-with	2	6	10	15
Without	3	12	21	27
Percent-with	0.8	2.5	4.1	6.2
Without	1.2	5.0	8.7	11.2
Second-with	2	14	26	30
Without	4	22	46	63
Percent-with	0.8	5.8	10.7	12.4
Without	1.7	9.1	19.0	26.0
Third-with	8	23	40	66
Without	5	9	9	21
Percent-with	3.3	9.5	16.5	27.3
Without	2.1	3.7	3.7	8.7

Appendix H (Continued)

Responses to Question Fourteen in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Would Marry Again.

Degree	Same Person	Different Person	Not at All
First-with	27	3	3
Without	50	9	4
Percent-with	11.2	1.2	1.2
Without	20.8	3.7	1.7
Second-with	62	5	4
Without	116	9	9
Percent-with	25.7	2.1	1.7
Without	48.1	3.7	3.7
Third-with	111	18	8
Without	34	8	2
Percent-with	46.1	7.5	3.3
Without	14.1	3.3	0.8

Responses to Question Fifteen in Percent of Total by Degree of Complementarity with and without the Five Year Rule. Topic: Confide in Spouse.

Degree	Almost Never	Rarely	In Most Things	In Everything
First-with	0	2	18	13
Without	0	3	38	22
Percent-with	0.0	0.8	7.4	5.4
Without	0.0	1.2	15.7	9.1
Second-with	2	1	50	19
Without	3	3	96	33
Percent-with	0.8	0.4	20.7	7.9
Without	1.2	1.2	39.7	13.6
Third-with	3	6	96	32
Without	2	3	30	9
Percent-with	1.2	2.5	39.7	13.2
Without	0.8	1.2	12.4	3.7